

From: Thomas Lyon Gideon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 8:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am appalled at the mere suggestion, in the proposed settlement, that Microsoft be "forced" to donate software, to a set limit, to schools. Aside from the, arguably invalid, implication that Microsoft sets their pricing so directing them to give away \$XXX worth of software means they could conceivably set their prices to give away one \$XXX copy of Windows.

What the DoJ must realize is that much path dependency when it comes to software is developed while users are in the educational system. If students learn Microsoft software, what are they going to be encouraged to buy when they matriculate and become good little consumers?

If anything, this aspect of the proposed settlement practically gives Microsoft a stronger hold on a potential enlarged consumer base than they already have. Rather than allowing them to propagate their software further, the proposed remedies for open up the ISVs and OEMs should have more teeth, especially the smaller, regional "white box" providers.

Letting Microsoft donate their product to a captive audience is more like spraying gasoline on a fire than spraying foam.

Thomas Gideon
Senior Software Engineer
B2eMarkets

--

"This beer is good for you. This is draft beer. Stick with the beer. Let's go and beat this guy up and come back and drink some more beer." -- Ernest Hemingway

mailto:thomas@gideonfamily.org
<http://www.gideonfamily.org/tom/>
jabber:Highlander@jabber.org